arXiv:1702.04661v1 [hep-th] 15 Feb 2017

February 2017

# Mirror Symmetry and Discriminants

**Paul S. Aspinwall, M. Ronen Plesser and Kangkang Wang**

Departments of Mathematics and Physics,
Box 90320,
Duke University,
Durham, NC 27708-0320

**Abstract**

We analyze the locus, together with multiplicities, of "bad" conformal field theories in the compactified moduli space of $N = (2, 2)$ superconformal field theories in the context of the generalization of the Batyrev mirror construction using the gauged linear $\sigma$-model. We find this discriminant of singular theories is described beautifully by the GKZ "A-determinant" but only if we use a noncompact toric Calabi–Yau variety on the A-model side and logarithmic coordinates on the B-model side. The two are related by "local" mirror symmetry. The corresponding statement for the compact case requires changing multiplicities in the GKZ determinant. We then describe a natural structure for monodromies around components of this discriminant in terms of spherical functors. This can be considered a categorification of the GKZ $A$-determinant. Each component of the discriminant is naturally associated with a category of massless D-branes.

# 1 Introduction

It is well known that the quintic hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^4$ is mirror to an orbifold of another quintic with defining equation

$$b_1x_1^5 + b_2x_2^5 + b_3x_3^5 + b_4x_4^5 + b_5x_5^5 + b_0x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5 = 0, \tag{1}$$

where the $b$'s are complex parameters. The quintic has a one dimensional moduli space of complexified Kähler forms, while the mirror has a one dimensional moduli space of complex structures given by the parameter $(5\psi)^5 = -b_0^5/(b_1b_2b_3b_4b_5)$. The mirror quintic becomes singular when $\psi^5 = 1$ and there is a corresponding singularity for conformal theories associated with the quintic with the appropriate Kähler form. The limit $\psi \to \infty$ is associated to the large radius limit of the quintic. For our purposes, this large radius limit should also be viewed as a kind of singularity in the natural toric compactification of the moduli space. These two points form the "discriminant". They correspond to the locus of "bad theories".

More generally, when there are more parameters, the discriminant is a codimension one subvariety. Typically this discriminant is a very complicated space. Generally it has more than one component. These components will intersect each other and may have singularities themselves. In string theory, the discriminant is associated with D-branes becoming massless (for suitable normalizations when considering the large radius limit) and thus often with interesting physics such as enhanced gauge symmetry or conformal field theories.

The picture we will see is that each component has a number (or category) associated to it and this measures the degree of singularity at a generic point on this component. One may also view this number as the multiplicity of the component. At singularities of the discriminant this degree will go higher, but our focus will be on the generic degree.

So how exactly should we measure the degree of a singularity? As straight-forward answer might be to compute some partition function and see the degrees appearing as the order of poles in this function. We won't do this here, but if we did, there would an interesting issue of an anomaly as we discuss later. An alternative approach, which we will use in this paper, is to look at the spectrum of D-branes and how they become massless at points on the discriminant.

The mathematics literature already contains a very natural answer to what degrees to attach to the components of the discriminant. This comes from the work of Gelfand, Kapranov and Zelevinsky [1]. There the "GKZ A-determinant" was defined. In the case of the quintic, this object is

$$E = b_1^4b_2^4b_3^4b_4^4b_5^4(b_0^5 + 5^5b_1b_2b_3b_4b_5). \tag{2}$$

Clearly the vanishing of $E$ is associated to singularities of the conformal field theory, but notice the 4th powers appearing. This determinant can also be computed for more complicated examples and again interesting powers appear in many places. The first purpose of this paper is to understand how and why these exponents appear using the language of the gauged linear $\sigma$-model (GLSM). We will tie these powers to the desired degrees of the components of the discriminant. However, in order for this to work, we are forced to consider *noncompact* mirror symmetry.

Batyrev's mirror symmetry construction [2] for Calabi–Yau hypersurfaces in toric varieties is naturally generalized by the GLSM to a whole class of families including complete intersections, but also models where no geometric large radius limit need exist [3–5].

We should note that the discriminant plays an important role in mirror symmetry. If $X$ and $Y$ are a mirror pair then the complexified Kähler form moduli space of $X$ (suitably corrected) should match the moduli space of complex structures on $Y$. In particular, the set of "bad" theories due to a Kähler degeneration of $X$ should match the bad theories for $Y$ for a singular complex structure. For mirror symmetry to work, the discriminants, complete with their multiplicities should agree between these moduli spaces $X$ and $Y$. Further, for mirror symmetry to extend to string theory, the massless brane spectra should agree.

This complete matching for the case of compact $X$ and $Y$ is actually quite hard to prove and we will not achieve it fully here. Instead we focus more on the very closely related question of the associated noncompact toric ambient Calabi–Yau's containing $X$ and $Y$, and here we do find complete agreement. In this case, the discriminant is the GKZ $A$-determinant and we will show that the discriminants do indeed match as mirror symmetry implies. However, to get this to work, we require a change to logarithmic coordinates for $Y$ as seen by Hori and Vafa [6] using duality arguments. As we will see, the GLSM provides a beautiful interpretation for the multiplicities appearing in the GKZ determinant in terms of noncompact mirror symmetry.

The general idea is that for each component of the discriminant, the GLSM can be broken up into a Higgs factor and a Coulomb factor. The Coulomb factor describes the breakdown of the conformal field theory in terms of some scalar fields becoming noncompact. Meanwhile, the multiplicity of this component in the discriminant is encoded in the Higgs factor.

It should be emphasized that the notion of multiplicity in the noncompact case seems to be very natural. As well as the rank of the charge lattice of massless D-branes, it has an interpretation in terms of the Witten index, or orbifold Euler characteristic of the Higgs theory. This coincides with the rank of the cohomology ring and thus the topological K-theory($K_0$) of the model in question. Furthermore, the toric geometry gives a coincidence between the cohomology ring and the Chow ring. This implies an equality between the rank of topological $K_0$ and algebraic $K_0$.

Being the rank of the group $K_0$, the multiplicities are naturally "categorified". We tie this in with the a natural description of monodromy around the discriminant. As we said above, the categorification in question is the "category of massless D-branes" as explored in [7]. The obvious thing to do is to identify this category of massless D-branes as precisely the category of D-branes of the Higgs theory. We will see this works in many cases.

The description becomes more awkward when we pass to the compact case. However, we note that matching the location of the discriminant and monodromy between the two sides may be viewed as a route to provide yet another "proof" of mirror symmetry. This might be regarded as somewhat easier than going via a computation Gromov–Witten indices requiring a knowledge of period integrals. However, they should, of course, be related by the Hilbert–Riemann correspondence.

We begin in section 2 by reviewing the general setup for the abelian GLSM. Then in

section 3 we discuss how the discriminant appears in terms of the complex structure model space, i.e., the B-model moduli space. This ties the discriminant analysis of the GLSM into the work of GKZ, but we find that there they do *not* fully coincide. In section 4 we then analyze how the A-model becomes singular. Each component of the discriminant is then described by a split of GLSM into a Higgs part and Coulomb part, where the Higgs part determines the multiplicity. We also see how to resolve the mismatch found in section 3 by going to the noncompact model.

In section 5 we recast the story in terms of D-brane categories. This turns out to give a very natural picture of the components of the discriminant. The D-brane category associated to each component is the source of a functor giving the generic monodromy around the discriminant in terms of a "spherical twist". Finally we give concluding remarks in section 6.

# 2 General Toric Mirror Symmetry

Here we review the set-up of toric data to define the GLSM and the resulting toric mirror symmetry statement. This is based on Batyrev's hypersurface construction [2] but then generalized to include all abelian GLSM's as in [3]. We refer to [8] for details. The data is as follows:

- On the "A side" we have a $d$-dimensional lattice $N$, a set of $n$ points $\mathscr{A}$ in $N$, $n$ complex parameters $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ and a vector $\nu \in N$.
- On the "B side" we have a lattice $M = N^\vee$, a set of $m$ points $\mathscr{B}$ in $M$, $m$ complex parameters $(b_1, \ldots, b_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and a vector $\mu \in M$.
- The pointset $\mathscr{A}$ lies in a hyperplane $\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle = 1$, for all $\alpha \in \mathscr{A}$ and the pointset $\mathscr{B}$ lies in a hyperplane $\langle \beta, \nu \rangle = 1$, for all $\beta \in \mathscr{B}$.
- We define the superpotential in $\mathbb{C}[\mathscr{A}] = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$,

$$W = \sum_{\beta \in \mathscr{B}} b_\beta x^\beta, \quad x^\beta = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathscr{A}} x_\alpha^{\langle \beta, \alpha \rangle}. \tag{3}$$

- We define a height function $\zeta : \mathscr{A} \to \mathbb{R}$ given by $\log |a_\alpha|$. For generic values of $a_\alpha$ this gives a triangulation of $\mathscr{A}$ (or "phase") and an associated fan $\Sigma$ over this triangulation. The particular triangulation we use is the one consistent with a convex piece-wise linear function taking the values of the height function at each point in $\mathscr{A}$.

The fan $\Sigma$ produces a toric variety $Z_\Sigma$ of dimension $d$ in the usual way. $Z_\Sigma$ is noncompact and Calabi–Yau because of the hyperplane condition. When $Z_\Sigma$ is smooth, the height function $\zeta$ can be used to produce a Kähler metric on $Z_\Sigma$ via symplectic reduction [9].

We then define the classical target space $X_\Sigma \subset Z_\Sigma$ as the critical point set of the superpotential $W$. For a suitable choice of phase, $X_\Sigma$ may be a compact Calabi–Yau manifold of




Figure 1: The data used to define a GLSM.



Figure 2: The pointset $\mathscr{A}$ for the octic hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^4_{2,2,2,1,1}$ (with one dimension missing).

dimension $d - 2\langle \mu, \nu \rangle$. The metric on $Z_\Sigma$ induces a metric on $X_\Sigma$ but this is not desired one. The true metric is realized through IR flow in the GLSM to the conformal field theory.

More generally $X_\Sigma$ will be associated with an $N = (2, 2)$ superconformal field theory, and $X_\Sigma$ may have the interpretation of an orbifold, Landau–Ginzburg theory, some LG-fibration hybrid model, etc.

The topological A-model [10] associated to this depends only the $a_\alpha$ parameters, which determine the (complexified) Kähler form. The topological B-model depends only on the $b_\beta$ parameters, which determine the complex structure when $X_\Sigma$ is a smooth Calabi–Yau. Mirror symmetry is an exchange of the A-side and B-side. That is, if $Y$ is mirror to $X$ then $Y$ has its A-model data given by $b_\beta$ and the B-model data given $a_\alpha$. Thus, we not only identify $X$ and $Y$ as mirrors. but we also *globally* identify their parameter spaces. Note that $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ acts on both set of parameters $a_\alpha$ and $b_\beta$ and that the resulting GLSM appears invariant under this action. Thus one might divide out by this action to obtain a more effective parametrization. We will find it useful to keep this apparently redundant parametrization most of the time. There could also be an anomaly associated with this $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ action as we will see in section 3.2.3.

It is worth emphasizing that we are using the $a_\alpha$'s to parametrize the Kähler moduli space and not the actual Kähler form cohomology class. The latter requires us to pass to "flat coordinates" by solving Picard–Fuch's equations. We completely evade this process by sticking with the "algebraic coordinates" given by $a_\alpha$. One can also argue that these algebraic coordinates are more naturally associated both with the toric structure and with the superconformal theory moduli space.

Let us fix an example to clarify the procedure. We use the "octic hypersurface" in $\mathbb{P}^4_{2,2,2,1,1}$ as analyzed in many places including [11]. Here $\mathscr{A}$ consists of 7 points, and $d = 5$. Five points lie at the vertices of a 4-simplex, one point lies in the proper interior of this simplex and the last point lies at the midpoint of a one-dimensional edge. We show this reduced by one dimension in figure 2. There are 4 triangulations of $\mathscr{A}$. The unique triangulation involving all 7 points gives $Z_\Sigma$ as a line bundle over the resolution of $\mathbb{P}^4_{2,2,2,1,1}$, and $X_\Sigma$ as the smooth Calabi–Yau hypersurface in this resolved weighted projective space. The pointset $\mathscr{B}$ has 105 points corresponding to the 105 monomials of degree 8 on $\mathbb{P}^4_{2,2,2,1,1}$.

Going to the mirror by exchanging $\mathscr{A}$ and $\mathscr{B}$, the pointset $\mathscr{B}$ now has 7 elements. Thus the superpotential for the mirror $Y_\Sigma$ has 7 monomials in 105 homogeneous coordinates. If we only include the 5 coordinates $x_\alpha$ associated to the vertices of $\mathscr{A}$ (as we would for the Landau–Ginzburg phase) the superpotential can be written

$$W = b_1 x_1^4 + b_2 x_2^4 + b_3 x_3^4 + b_4 x_4^8 + b_5 x_5^8 + b_6 x_4^4 x_5^4 + b_7 x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4 x_5. \tag{4}$$

# 3 The B-Side Discriminant

## 3.1 $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$

We now review the motivation and construction of the "$A$-determinant" of [1]. To fit in with the notation used in this paper, we will need to call it the $\mathscr{B}$-determinant for now. We begin with the definition of an associated object $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$.

Assume we are given a set of points $\mathscr{B}$ in a hyperplane in $M \cong \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_d\}$ be a basis of the dual lattice $N = M^\vee$. We can define a Laurent polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[y_1, \ldots, y_d]$.

$$W = \sum_{\beta \in \mathscr{B}} b_\beta \prod_{i=1}^{d} y_i^{\langle b_\beta, e_i \rangle}, \tag{5}$$

for complex parameters $b_\beta$. We now might ask if the hypersurface $W = 0$ in $\mathbb{C}^d$ is singular. That is, is there a solution of

$$W = \frac{\partial W}{\partial y_1} = \ldots = \frac{\partial W}{\partial y_d} = 0, \tag{6}$$

for some $y_i$? Since we might have negative powers of $y_i$, we should restrict the question to all the $y_i$'s being nonzero, in order to have a well-posed question. There will be a subset of parameters $b_\beta$ for which we can find a solution of (6). Assuming this pointset is codimension one, this gives an irreducible function $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ of $b_\beta$, such that the (Zariski closure of) the above subset of parameters is given by $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}} = 0$.

GKZ refer to $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ as the "discriminant" of $W$. Indeed one usually associates the vanishing of the discriminant to singularities. In this paper we will avoid using the word "discriminant" for $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$. This is because $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}} = 0$ represents only some of the possibilities for singularities. In particular, the constraint that all $y_i$'s be nonzero is too strong. We will use the term discriminant to refer to the *complete* locus of "bad" GLSM's.

One can compute $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ most efficiently using the "Horn uniformization" trick [1, 12]. Let $B$ be the $d \times m$ matrix given by the coordinates of the points $\beta \in \mathscr{B}$, and let $S$ be the $r \times m$ matrix given as the kernel of $B^t$ over the integers, where $r = m - d$. Let $s_{i\beta}$ be the integral entries of $S$. We then have $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$-invariant coordinates

$$z_i = \prod_{\beta \in \mathscr{B}} b_\beta^{s_{i\beta}}, \tag{7}$$

parametrizing the complex structure moduli space. $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ is then given in parametrized form

$$z_i = \prod_{\beta \in \mathscr{B}} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} s_{j\beta} \lambda_j \right)^{s_{i\beta}}, \tag{8}$$

where $[\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r] \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$. That is, we may find $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ by eliminating $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_r$ from (8).

In the case that $r$ is around 4 or less, a computer algebra package may perform the elimination required, but for larger values, $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ has many many terms and becomes impractical to compute.

The elements of $\mathscr{B}$ may be viewed as monomials in the homogeneous coordinate ring, with coordinates corresponding to points in $\mathscr{A}$. With this interpretation, let $Z_0 = \operatorname{Spec} \mathbb{C}[\mathscr{B}]$. Note that if $\operatorname{Cone} \operatorname{Conv}(\mathscr{A})$ is dual to $\operatorname{Cone} \operatorname{Conv}(\mathscr{B})$, i.e., we are in the reflexive case, then $Z_0$ is the affine toric variety corresponding to the cone over $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$. That is, $Z_0$ corresponds to the "non-simplicial-decomposition" of $\mathscr{A}$. $Z_0$ is a *phase* $Z_\Sigma$ if and only if $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$ is itself a simplex.

Let $\Omega^\bullet_{Z_0}$ denote the ring of differential forms on $Z_0$. Note that, in addition to the usual degree of a differential form, the $R$-charge vector $\nu$ induces another degree on this ring, where every monomial in $\mathscr{B}$ has $R$-charge 1. One can then consider the Koszul complex:

$$\Omega^0_{Z_0} \xrightarrow{\wedge dW} \Omega^1_{Z_0} \xrightarrow{\wedge dW} \ldots \tag{9}$$

This complex will be exact if and only if $dW$ is nowhere vanishing on $Z_0$. We may turn this into a complex of vector spaces by taking global sections and restricting to a particular $R$-charge.[1]

Using a method due to Cayley, one may compute a "determinant" of a complex of vector spaces which vanishes precisely when the complex fails to be exact. GKZ prove that this determinant correctly computes $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ but only in the rather restrictive case that $\operatorname{Proj} \mathbb{C}[\mathscr{B}]$ is smooth. As well as this rather restrictive condition, which is violated in almost any case we would like to consider, the description of differential forms on a toric variety is a little unnatural when it comes to computations. We discuss the resolution of this problem shortly.

Let us consider the singularities of the B-model in the case that we have a geometrical interpretation. The simplest case is when $X_\Sigma$ is a hypersurface in a toric variety. Then $W$ is of the form

$$W = x_0 f(x_1, x_2, \ldots). \tag{10}$$

[1] For computations an arbitrarily large $R$-charge is chosen so that higher cohomologies vanish. That is, we have a *stable twisting* [1].

A compact toric variety $V \subset Z$ is given by $x_0 = 0$, and the hypersurface $X \subset V$ by $f = 0$. As discussed in the next section, the theory is singular if $x_0$ is not forced to be zero by the constraint $dW = 0$, since that would give us a noncompact target space. Since $dW = f dx_0 + x_0 df$, the theory is singular when $f = df = 0$ has a solution (for suitably nonzero $x_\alpha$). This is the familiar condition for a hypersurface singularity. Restricting to the hypersurface $f = 0$, the degree of $dW$ is the same as the degree of $df$. In the case of isolated singularities this is equal to the *Milnor Number* of the singularity. A generic deformation of the singularity hypersurface will produce a smooth hypersurface with a bouquet of spheres growing out of the singularity. The number of spheres is the Milnor number.

So in this special case we see that the degree of vanishing of $dW$ gives the Milnor number which measures the complexity of the singularity. In the most general case, there is not a geometrical interpretation so we cannot always have this Milnor number interpretation.

## 3.2 The GKZ $\mathscr{B}$-Determinant

### 3.2.1 Definition

In order to analyze some general properties of the discriminant, GKZ introduced the $\mathscr{B}$-determinant[2] $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ [1]. This has, in general, even more terms that $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$ and is thus even more impractical to completely compute for generic examples. But in some ways it has a nicer structure. In particular it is easy to compute the coefficients of some of the monomials in $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ which have a correspondence to vertices of the convex hull of the Newton polytope. More importantly for us, the $\mathscr{B}$-determinant will be a very natural object to study in the context of the GLSM.

Let $Z_1 \subset Z_0$ be the union of all the toric coordinate hyperplanes. That is, $Z_1$ is given by a divisor where any homogeneous coordinate vanishes. Let $\Omega^\bullet_{Z_0}(\log Z_1)$ be the ring of *logarithmic* differential forms on $Z_0$. Such differential forms are allowed simple poles along $Z_1$. That is, if $y_i$ are affine coordinates in a patch where $Z_1$ corresponds to the coordinate hyperplanes, then we consider forms with terms like

$$f(y_1, y_2, \ldots) \frac{dy_i}{y_i} \wedge \frac{dy_j}{y_j} \ldots \tag{11}$$

If we put $Y_j = \log y_j$, then such a form becomes holomorphic:

$$f(e^{Y_1}, e^{Y_2}, \ldots)\, dY_i \wedge dY_j \ldots, \tag{12}$$

hence the notation $\Omega^\bullet_{Z_0}(\log Z_1)$.

Logarithmic differential forms are much more natural in toric geometry than normal differential forms since they are invariant under the torus action. A basis for sections of the cotangent sheaf of $T_N \cong N \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}^* \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ is given by

$$\frac{dy_1}{y_1}, \frac{dy_2}{y_2}, \ldots, \frac{dy_d}{y_d}. \tag{13}$$

[2] $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ is only defined up to a sign.



Figure 3: A redundant face not included in the GKZ determinant.

(See exercise 8.1.1 of [13].) Indeed, the best way to construct $\Omega^\bullet_{Z_0}$ is to first construct $\Omega^\bullet_{Z_0}(\log Z_1)$ and then impose the condition that there are no poles along $Z_1$. This restriction is described in definition 2.3 in chapter 9 of [1].

It is combinatorially more natural than (9), therefore, to consider the Koszul complex

$$\Omega^0_{Z_0}(\log Z_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge dW} \Omega^1_{Z_0}(\log Z_1) \xrightarrow{\wedge dW} \dots \tag{14}$$

Taking global sections of the terms in this complex and fixing an R-charge we may again compute the Cayley determinant. This is the GKZ $\mathscr{B}$-determinant $E_{\mathscr{B}}$.

### 3.2.2 Relation to Discriminants

One of the main results of GKZ [1] is that there is a relationship between $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ and $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$:

$$E_{\mathscr{B}} = \prod_{\Gamma} (\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma})^{u(\Gamma)i(\Gamma)}, \tag{15}$$

where the product is taken over all the faces $\Gamma$ of $\operatorname{Conv}\mathscr{B}$. The faces are of any dimension and include the whole of $\operatorname{Conv}\mathscr{B}$. The $u(\Gamma)$'s and $i(\Gamma)$'s are nonnegative integers we will describe shortly.

Note that in the previous section we only really defined $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma}$ up to an overall constant. The GKZ definition of the $\mathscr{B}$-determinant as a function of the $b_\beta$'s completely fixes everything up to an overall sign. One manifestation of this is that, while the Horn uniformization of equations (7) and (8) imply the corresponding $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma}$'s are $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$-invariant, the $\mathscr{B}$-determinant turns out *not* to be $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$-invariant. However, this $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ dependence is purely an overall factor. We'll discuss this more below, but we note now that the divisor determined by $E_{\mathscr{B}} = 0$ *is* $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$-invariant.

We need to be a little careful about how exactly we form the product (15). If $\Gamma$ is a face of dimension $> 0$ and $\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma$ consists purely of points at the vertices of a simplex then there is no affine relation between them. A such, when we form the Horn uniformization, $r = 0$. The result is that $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma} = 1$. So we ignore faces with no affine relation. An exception is made for vertices. In that case we set

$$\Delta_{\{\beta\}} = b_\beta. \tag{16}$$

Faces $\Gamma$ are also excluded from the product in (15) if they are redundant in the sense that any affine relation between points in $\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma$ can be expressed in terms of affine relations




Figure 4: The shape in the computation of $u(\Gamma)$.

between points in $\mathscr{B} \cap \Xi$, where $\Xi$ is a proper subface of $\Gamma$. Such faces produce a factor $\Delta_\Gamma$ that coincides with a factor given by a lower-dimensional face. Including such redundant faces would give incorrect multiplicities. A redundant face is shown in figure 3.

The quantity $i(\Gamma)$ is defined as follows. The vectors from the origin to points in the face $\Gamma$ span a linear subspace $\Gamma_\mathbb{R} \subset M_\mathbb{R}$. The points in $\mathscr{B} \cap \Gamma$ span a sublattice $\Gamma_\mathbb{Z} \subset M$. $i(\Gamma)$ is defined as the index $[\Gamma_\mathbb{R} \cap M : \Gamma_\mathbb{Z}]$. In simple cases $i(\Gamma) = 1$ for all faces. This is true in all the examples we will consider. To simplify discussion we will ignore this quantity even though it can be properly taken into account.

The quantity $u(\Gamma)$ is more interesting and is central to this paper. A set of points in a lattice like we consider in this paper generate a semigroup $S$ under addition. The quotient $S/\Gamma$ is also a semigroup and can be thought of as a set of points in the quotient lattice $M/\Gamma_\mathbb{Z}$. Let $(S/\Gamma)_+$ denote the set of points (or semigroup) with the origin removed.

Let $\mathrm{Cone}(S/\Gamma)_+$ be the cone generated by rays from the origin to any element of $(S/\Gamma)_+$. Note that this is clearly a pointed cone (i.e., contains no linear subspace), since $\Gamma$ is a face. Let $\mathrm{Conv}(S/\Gamma)_+$ be the convex hull as usual. Then

$$u(\Gamma) = \mathrm{Vol}\Big(\mathrm{Cone}(S/\Gamma)_+ - \mathrm{Conv}(S/\Gamma)_+\Big), \tag{17}$$

where the volume is taken relative to the lattice $M/\Gamma_\mathbb{Z}$ using the usual normalization that a basic simplex is volume 1.

We show this volume in figure 4. Note that the base of the "pyramid" will be concave, as shown in the figure, or flat.

Since the polynomials $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Gamma}$ are irreducible, the expression (15) is precisely the factorization of $E_\mathscr{B}$ and the numbers $u(\Gamma)$ give the multiplicity of each irreducible component.

A special mention should be made for the case where $\Gamma$ is the whole of $\mathrm{Conv}\,\mathscr{B}$. Assuming this face is not redundant, we set $u(\Gamma) = 1$. This factor $\Delta_\mathscr{B}$ is called the "primary component". In the Batyrev case, where $\langle \mu, \nu \rangle = 1$, there is a point in the proper interior of the $\mathrm{Conv}\,\mathscr{B}$ and so this maximal $\Gamma$ cannot be redundant. Thus, in this case the primary component always appears as a factor of $E_\mathscr{B}$ with multiplicity one. In general, there are cases where there the primary component does not appear.

The vertices of $\mathrm{Conv}\,\mathscr{B}$ giving the monomial contributions (16) are associated to the phase picture of the GLSM. When we view the moduli space as a toric variety in the usual way, some (but not all) of the toric divisors are associated with these vertices.




Figure 5: The discriminant for the octic example.

Returning to our octic (mirror) example, let $\mathscr{B}$ be given by the seven points in figure 2 and (4). Here we have a primary component given by the full simplex. We also have a contribution to $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ coming from the 3 points along an edge, which comes with multiplicity 3; as well as contributions from the 5 vertices. The result is[3]

$$E_{\mathscr{B}} = b_1^6 b_2^6 b_3^6 b_4^4 b_5^4 \, (b_6^2 - 4 b_4 b_5)^3 \, (2^{18} b_1^2 b_2^2 b_3^2 b_4 b_5 - 2^{16} b_1^2 b_2^2 b_3^2 b_6^2 + 2^9 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_6 b_7^4 - b_7^8). \tag{18}$$

The torus $T_N = (\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ acts on $b_1, \ldots, b_9$ to leave 2 invariant coordinates on the moduli space

$$x = \frac{b_1 b_2 b_3 b_6}{b_7^4}, \quad y = \frac{b_4 b_5}{b_6^2}. \tag{19}$$

This gives a discriminant as shown in figure 5 (drawing complex dimensions as real). The 4 toric points are associated with phase limits of the mirror as studied in [11] and we label these points accordingly in the figure. The numbers in circles show the multiplicity. Note that two of the four toric divisors ($b_6 = 0$ and $b_7 = 0$) are *not* in the discriminant and are shown as dashed lines in the figure.

### 3.2.3 The "anomalous" degree of $E_{\mathscr{B}}$

The polynomial $W$ has $M$ monomials in the $y$'s with coefficients $b_\beta$. The $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ action on the $y$'s thus induces a $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$-action on the $b_\beta$'s and therefore $E_\beta$. The determinant $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ is therefore associated to a character of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$, which is given by a vector $D \in M$.

If $E_\beta$ were to be computed directly as a quantity in the GLSM, one would expect $D$ to be zero. This is because the $(\mathbb{C}^*)^d$ rescalings are simple field redefinitions and should thus have no effect classically. A nonzero $D$ would represent an anomaly. It is of central interest, therefore, to compute $D$.

$D$ may be calculated directly from the definition of $E_\beta$. The result is as follows. Let $S$ be the semigroup generated by $\mathscr{B}$ again. Let $S_l$ denote the elements $s \in S$ with $R$-charge $l$, i.e., $l = \langle s, \nu \rangle$.

[3]We will always ignore the overall sign ambiguity in $E_{\mathscr{B}}$.

The result is as follows. Identifying $s \in S$ with a vector in the lattice $M$, we define

$$D_k = \sum_{l=0}^{d} (-1)^{d+l} \binom{d}{l} \sum_{s \in S_{k+l}} s. \tag{20}$$

It follows from the definition of $E_\beta$ in chapter 10, section 1A of [1] that

$$D = \lim_{k \to \infty} D_k. \tag{21}$$

That is, there is some number $K$ such that $D_k = D$ for all $k \geq K$.

Define

$$\bar{s}_l = \frac{\sum_{s \in S_l} s}{l|S_l|}. \tag{22}$$

Then $\bar{s}_l$ is a vector pointing in the direction of the center of mass of $S_l$ normalized to have R-charge 1. This gives

$$D = \lim_{k \to \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{d} (-1)^{d+l} \binom{d}{l} |S_{k+l}|(k+l)\bar{s}_{k+l}. \tag{23}$$

The quantity $|S_l|$ is given by the Ehrhart polynomial (see, for example, [14]). Comparing coefficients of $x^m$ in the series expansion of

$$e^{kx}(e^x - 1)^d = \sum_{l=0}^{d} (-1)^{d+l} \binom{d}{l} e^{(l+k)x}, \tag{24}$$

we see

$$\sum_{l=0}^{d} (-1)^{d+l} \binom{d}{l} (l+k)^m = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } m < d \\ d! & \text{for } m = d \end{cases} \tag{25}$$

The sum in (23) therefore picks out the leading term of the Ehrhart polynomial, which is given by $(d-1)!$ times the volume of the pointset $B$.[4] This yields

$$D = d\,\mathrm{Vol}(B)\bar{s}, \tag{26}$$

where $\bar{s}$ denotes the limit of $\bar{s}_l$ as $l \to \infty$, i.e., the normalized "center of mass" of the cone.

So, in particular, $D$ is not zero. $D$ points in the direction of the center of mass of the cone over $B$. Note that this direction is not, in general, the same direction as the vector $\mu \in M$ introduced earlier.

[4] Assuming the points in $B$ generate $M$ as an abelian group.

### 3.3 Locating Bad Theories

Now we will try to relate the GKZ $\mathscr{B}$-determinant to the discriminant of bad theories in the moduli space of complex structures. This was analyzed in detail in [8] so we will review it only briefly here. We analyze the conditions for the *compact* model $X_\Sigma$ to be nonsingular but we will find it does not reproduce $E_{\mathscr{B}}$.

The criterion for a GLSM being singular is that the classical vacuum is not compact. In [8] it was shown that this can be determined by whether the $\mathbb{C}^*$ orbit associated with the vector $\nu \in N$, i.e., the R-charge, is compact in $Z_0$.

The key short exact sequence for the toric construction is

$$0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{A^t} \mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}} \xrightarrow{Q} \widehat{G} \longrightarrow 0, \tag{27}$$

where $A$ is the $d \times n$ matrix representing the coordinates of $\alpha$ and $Q$ is the $r \times n$ matrix so that $Q^t$ is the kernel of $A$, where $r = n - d$. $\widehat{G}$ is the dual group $\mathrm{Hom}_Z(G, \mathbb{C}^*)$, where $G$ is the gauge symmetry of the GLSM. $Q$ is the matrix of "charges" of the homogeneous coordinates $x_\alpha$ under the $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r \subset G$ quotient action. We can construct affine coordinates $y_i$ as in the previous section from

$$y_i = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathscr{A}} x_\alpha^{A_{i\alpha}}, \tag{28}$$

so that

$$y_i \frac{\partial W}{\partial y_i} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathscr{A}} A_{i\alpha} x_\alpha \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_\alpha} \tag{29}$$

Assume for the time being that $x_\alpha \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathscr{A}$. Clearly $dW = 0$ with respect to the affine coordinates is a stronger condition that $dW = 0$ with respect to the homogeneous coordinates. The difference between these conditions is precisely the $(\mathbb{C}^*)^r$ orbits we quotient out by anyway. So we may unambiguously refer to the condition $dW = 0$ for the critical point set. If we set any $x_\alpha$'s equal to zero, we need to be a little more careful.

If $dW = 0$ has a solution where all the homogeneous coordinates $x_\alpha$ are nonzero then there is a noncompact $\mathbb{C}^*$-orbit. This yields bad theories along the primary component $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}}$.

The other possibilities for the discriminant are where some of the coordinates $x_\alpha$ are zero. This happens potentially for any face of $\mathrm{Conv}\,\mathscr{A}$ [8]. That is, if $\Xi$ is a face of $\mathrm{Conv}\,\mathscr{A}$ then we set

$$x_\alpha = 0 \quad \text{iff } \alpha \in \Xi \cap \mathscr{A} \tag{30}$$

and check if the $\mathbb{C}^*$ orbit from $\nu$ is compact. Setting these $x_\alpha$'s to zero will set any monomial in $\mathscr{B}$ to zero unless that monomial contains $x_\alpha$ with exponent 0. That is, we restrict $W$ to having monomials in $\mathscr{B} \cap \Xi^\vee$. The discriminant $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Xi^\vee}$ will therefore describe solutions of the problem $dW = 0$ for this restricted theory without the points $\alpha \in \Xi$. That is we are solving

$$\frac{\partial W}{\partial x_\alpha} = 0, \quad \forall \alpha \notin \Xi. \tag{31}$$

But this isn't what we want. We require *all* the derivatives of $W$ to vanish. The condition $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Xi^\vee} = 0$ is therefore weaker than finding a noncompact $\mathbb{C}^*$-orbit. Note that we can also

state the weaker condition by saying that the discriminant $\Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Xi^\vee}$ represents the solutions of

$$x_\alpha \frac{\partial W}{\partial x_\alpha} = 0, \quad \forall \alpha. \tag{32}$$

We see that the locus of singular theories in the B-side moduli space is a subset of the vanishing locus of

$$\prod_{\Xi \subset \operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}} \Delta_{\mathscr{B}\cap\Xi^\vee}. \tag{33}$$

The reflexive condition says that the faces of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{B}$ are precisely the dual faces of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$. In this case we see that (33) becomes $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ ignoring the multiplicities.

The determinant $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ therefore does *not* represent the locus of singular theories for the GLSM with target space $X_\Sigma$. We discuss the differences in section 4.3. In particular, the true discriminant for $X_\Sigma$ will typically lack some of the components of $E_{\mathscr{B}}$ and will have different multiplicities.

# 4 The A-Side Discriminant

## 4.1 Components

If mirror symmetry works, we expect to find a model of the discriminant on the A-side associated with the pointset $\mathscr{A}$ in the same way that the pointset $\mathscr{B}$ was used in the previous section.

There are two ways the theory can become singular due to deformations of the $a_\alpha$ parameters:

1. Since the $a_\alpha$'s control the Kähler form and thus size of $X_\Sigma$, we can go to some limit where $X_\Sigma$ becomes infinitely large and thus not compact.

2. The fields $\sigma_i$ (see below) in the GLSM may become massless and then fluctuate over a noncompact space.

In the first possibility we are going to the boundary of the moduli space. In the toric model of the moduli space coming from the secondary fan, this means we are going to toric divisors. We saw in the previous section that it was vertices on the convex hull of $\mathscr{B}$ that gave such contributions, and so now we expect points appearing as vertices of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$ to account for these parts of the discriminant.

Now let us focus on the second possibility. We refer to [15] for a description of the $\sigma_i$ fields. All we really need to know about them here is that they have masses controlled by $a_\alpha$'s. For generic $a_\alpha$'s these fields are massive and can be integrated out.

We can find the location of the discriminant following [15] by setting the $\sigma_i$ fields to have large vevs. This gives masses to the $x_\alpha$ fields which can then be integrated out. The equations of motion then put a condition on the $a_\alpha$'s which beautifully reproduces the Horn uniformization formula (8). The $\sigma_i$'s play the rôle of the parameters $\lambda_i$ in this equivalence.

It is important to note [15] that in order to get the agreement with the Horn uniformization formula, it is necessary do compute a tadpole-like one-loop correction term when integrating out the $x_\alpha$ fields.

Anyway, we have nicely reproduced $\Delta_{\mathscr{A}}$ for part of the discriminant on the A-side. What about the other components? This was described heuristically in [15] and then more carefully in [8]. For non-singular models, we give vevs to the scalar fields $x_\alpha$ and this is viewed as a Higgs phase. When we give vevs to the $\sigma_i$ fields, which live in vector superfields, we consider it to be in a Coulomb phase. Naturally we can consider a mixed Coulomb–Higgs phase where some $x_\alpha$'s have vevs and some $\sigma_i$'s have vevs. To this end we split the GLSM into two parts so we can put one part in the Coulomb phase and the other in the Higgs phase. Choose a subgroup $\widehat{G}_h \subset \widehat{G}$ and let $\widehat{G}_c$ be the quotient $\widehat{G}/\widehat{G}_h$, with $\pi_h$ the quotient map. Let $e_\alpha$ be a basis for $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}}$. Then define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{A}_h &= \{\alpha \in \mathscr{A} : \pi_h Q e_\alpha = 0\} \\ \mathscr{A}_c &= \mathscr{A} - \mathscr{A}_h. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

In [8] the following was proven:

**Proposition 1.** *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M_c & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}_c} & \xrightarrow{Q_c} & \widehat{G}_c & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow{\scriptstyle \pi_h} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \xrightarrow{A^t} & \mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}} & \xrightarrow{Q} & \widehat{G} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & M_h & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}_h} & \xrightarrow{Q_h} & \widehat{G}_h & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array} \tag{35}$$

*with all rows and columns exact. Here $Q_c$ is defined as $\pi_h Q$ restricted to $\mathbb{Z}^{\mathscr{A}_c}$, and $Q_h$ exists uniquely to make the diagram commute. $M_c$ and $M_h$ are defined as the kernels of $Q_c$ and $Q_h$ respectively.*

The first row in (35) represents the Coulomb GLSM and the last row represents the Higgs GLSM. Of central interest to us is this Higgs GLSM. This GLSM is constructed from the points $\mathscr{A}$ living in quotient lattice $N_h$ of $N$ dual to the sublattice $M_h \subset M$. While the pointset $\mathscr{A}$ lives in a hyperplane, the Higgs pointset $\mathscr{A}_h$ need *not* lie in a hyperplane in $N_h$. That is, the Higgs data need not obey the Calabi–Yau condition.

We want consider the conformal field theory associated to the GLSM which means we want to consider the endpoint of infrared renormalization group flow. If the Calabi–Yau




Figure 6: The result of IR flow.

condition is violated, the IR flow will move us in the A-model moduli space of this Higgs model. In [8] it was argued that we should impose the condition $N_{c,\mathbb{R}}$ should meet $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$ along a face. If we do not obey this condition, then the IR flow simply takes us to a model where we do obey this condition, and we would just end up over-counting the various possibilities.

So, for each face $\Upsilon$ of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$ we can split the GLSM into a Higgs part and Coulomb part. The data in the Coulomb part is given by the pointset in $\Upsilon$ and we can simply redo the computation we did at the start of this section and obtain a discriminant component $\Delta_{\mathscr{A}\cap\Upsilon}$. Comparing to (15) we see we are getting close to the $E_{\mathscr{A}}$ determinant.

## 4.2 Multiplicities

The Coulomb part of the theory describes the decompactification and thus the fact that the GLSM has become singular. The Higgs part therefore describes the "internal" part of this singular theory. It should therefore be a natural source of the description of the multiplicity of the singularity.

Let $\Upsilon$ be a face of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$. The Coulomb theory is associated to the pointset $\mathscr{A} \cap \Upsilon$ and the Higgs theory is associated to the pointset in the quotient $\mathscr{A}/\Upsilon$ (where the quotient refers to modding out by the linear subspace spanned by the face $\Upsilon$).

Let us first ignore the superpotential and consider the noncompact Higgs GLSM given by $\mathscr{A}/\Upsilon$. The original pointset $\mathscr{A}$ lay in a hyperplane which forces $Z_\Sigma$ to be Calabi–Yau. The pointset $\mathscr{A}/\Upsilon$ will, in general, not lie in a hyperplane. The IR flow process will therefore be nontrivial. This IR flow process has been studied in [16, 17].

The general idea is that IR flow favours points closer to the origin rather than further away, since the closer points are more relevant in the final conformal field theory. In toric geometry language, a concave fan represents a positive canonical class, which corresponds to negative curvature. The IR flow is roughly given by Ricci flow which would make negatively curved regions larger. Conversely, convex fans correspond to positive curvature which shrink down in the IR flow.

The result of a typical IR flow is shown in figure 6. We begin with the fan on the left. The point $a$ represents an irrelevant operator or region of positive curvature. This will shrink down in the flow. The point $b$ represents a relevant operator which was ignored. By including this in the fan, we get a region of negative curvature that will expand. Thus we end up with

the fan on the right.

The result of IR flow is that we reproduce the results of section 3.3. We obtain

**Proposition 2.** *The points used for constructing the rays of the fan are those appearing as the vertices of* $\mathrm{Conv}(S/\Upsilon)_+$.

We need to obtain the multiplicities from this geometry. A natural first guess would be the Witten index, or (orbifold) Euler characteristic. A more sophisticated guess, which will be shown to be more appropriate in section 5, would be the rank of the topological K-theory group $K_0$ of the model. Happily, for toric varieties, these two numbers coincide as we discuss later.

We would therefore like to compute the Euler characteristic of the fan over $\mathrm{Conv}(S/\Upsilon)_+$. We claim this coincides perfectly with $u(\Upsilon)$:

**Proposition 3.** *The (orbifold) Euler characteristic of the toric variety associated with the IR limit of the Higgs GLSM is*

$$\chi = \mathrm{Vol}\Big(\mathrm{Cone}(S/\Upsilon)_+ - \mathrm{Conv}(S/\Upsilon)_+\Big), \tag{36}$$

To prove this note that a toric variety is the union of all the various torus orbits. The Euler characteristic is additive so we just need to add up the contribution of these orbits.

Let $\tau$ be a face of the fan. The orbit cone correspondence associates a torus-orbit $O(\tau)$ with this face. If the torus orbit $O(\tau)$ has positive dimension then it is a torus itself and has $\chi = 0$. So we only care about torus fixed points, i.e., maximal cones in $\Sigma$ under the orbit-cone correspondence. Without loss of generality we may assume the fan has been subdivided to be simplicial. In this case, each maximal cone corresponds to an affine toric variety of the form $\mathbb{C}^d/H$ for some finite abelian group $H$. The volume of this maximal cone is given by the order of the group, $|H|$. However, the orbifold Euler characteristic is given by the number of twisted sectors, which is also $|H|$. Thus the total Euler characteristic is the total volume of the fan. ■

We have, therefore, agreement for the multiplicities of the components of the GKZ determinant and the multiplicities associates with the Higgs theories. But it is important to note that we have not yet imposed the superpotential constraint.

## 4.3 Compact vs Noncompact Mirror Symmetry

In the previous section we computed the multiplicities for the Higgs toric variety associated with $\mathscr{A}/\Upsilon$. This is a noncompact toric variety. This is exactly the Higgs part of theory associated with the noncompact $Z_\Sigma$ as opposed to the compact $X_\Sigma$.

We should also note that computation of the GKZ $\mathscr{B}$-determinant was not the same as the computation of the singularities of $X_\Sigma$. In particular, *logarithmic* differential forms were used for computing the vanishing of $dW$ in (14). This amounts to using logarithmic coordinates for the GLSM.

We therefore arrive at

**Proposition 4.** *The discriminants of singular theories are consistent, including multiplicities, with mirror symmetry for the GLSM moduli spaces if we compare the Kähler moduli space of the* noncompact *toric variety $Z_\Sigma$ with the mirror theory $Y$ but using logarithmic coordinates.*

For the latter, we would write the superpotential as a polynomial in $\exp(Y_\beta)$. This idea of noncompact Calabi–Yau s being mirror to compact theories with log coordinates is not new. It appeared in the work of [6], where mirror GLSM's are directly obtained by a duality construction. Logarithmic coordinates also appeared earlier in [18].

The astute reader will notice that we have cheated badly by switching to a statement about noncompact mirror symmetry. The motivation for the appearance of singularities associated to the discriminant came from a noncompact target space. In our picture of noncompact mirror symmetry the targets space is now always noncompact!

The solution to this quandary is as follows. We should actually compute some well-behaved correlation functions and see where they diverge. However, it is fairly clear what would happen. On the A-side we would use operators corresponding to cohomology classes with compact support. Such compactness of support would be lost when the $\sigma$-vacua appear if the support of the representative of the class touched that point, i.e., if the corresponding $x_\alpha$'s vanished. Thus we would argue that the same argument to locate the discriminant works just as well in the noncompact as the compact case.

To pass back to the compact version of mirror symmetry we would expect to modify multiplicities on both sides. On the B-side we need to restore the log coordinates back to normal coordinates. The analogue of (14) in normal coordinates is not as easy to compute. In particular a useful determinantal computation such as theorem 2.7 of [1] relies on a smoothness condition which will be violated in most cases.

Actually the issues of multiplicities in the compact case is quite awkward. There is no longer an agreement between total cohomology and Euler characteristic. Furthermore, when we categorify, we no longer have agreement with topological K-theory and algebraic K-theory. We will therefore mainly restrict our attention to multiplicities in the noncompact model in this paper.

A case where a rigorous argument shows that the multiplicity *must* change as we go to compact model is that of $\mathbb{P}^4_{\{9,6,1,1,1\}}$ as studied in [19]. This weighted projective space has a $\mathbb{Z}_3$ quotient singularity along $[x_1, x_2, 0, 0, 0]$. Let $Z$ be the total space of the canonical line bundle over this projective space blown-up along this locus. Note that $Z$ still has quotient singularities. Let $X$ be the degree 18 hypersurface in this blown-up weighted projective space. $X$ generically misses the singularities in $Z$ and is then smooth. This example has $h^{1,1} = 2$ and the discriminant is shown in figure 7. In particular, there are two components $\Delta_0$ and $\Delta_1$. Although it is far from obvious from the figure, there is a symmetry of this model on $X$ which exchanges these two components. To restore this $\mathbb{Z}_2$ symmetry on the moduli space, one must do a sequence of blow-ups as performed in [19].

At the noncompact level, $Z$ has multiplicities 1 and 5 respectively for these components. The symmetry is therefore broken. In order to restore the symmetry for $X$, the multiplicity for $\Delta_1$ must be reduced to one.




Figure 7: The discriminant for $\mathbb{P}^4_{\{9,6,1,1,1\}}$.

## 4.4 Vertices of Conv $\mathscr{A}$

At the start of section 4.1 we said that there were two sources of singularities in the Kähler moduli space. We have dealt with the second source, namely when the $\sigma_i$'s become massless. These reproduce the Horn uniformization formula, which accounts for all the factors in $E_{\mathscr{A}}$ *except the contribution for vertices*. The vertex contributions are associated to monomials in $b_\beta$ and are thus associated to toric divisors in the moduli space. That is, we associate these singularities to phase limits such as large radius limits.

Recall the determinant for the quintic:

$$E = b_1^4 b_2^4 b_3^4 b_4^4 b_5^4 (b_0^5 + 5^5 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4 b_5). \tag{37}$$

How do we explain in the multiplicity of 4 associated to the large radius limit $b_1 \to 0$? We will understand this more clearly, and convincingly, when we describe spherical functors later but argue for now as follows. In the noncompact model, the $\mathbb{P}^4$ expands to infinite size in the large radius limit. Thus 8-branes, 6-branes, 4-branes and 2-branes wrapping this space become infinitely massive. Suppose we wish to normalize the masses of D-branes such that nothing associated to compact cycles becomes infinite. A natural choice would be to normalize the mass of 8 branes, wrapping the whole $\mathbb{P}^4$, to be one. If we do this, the masses of 6-branes, 4-branes, 2-branes and 0-branes are all massless in the large radius limit. It is as if a $\mathbb{P}^3$'s worth of D-branes have become massless. Then $\chi(\mathbb{P}^3) = 4$ explains the observed multiplicity.

Note, furthermore, that the GKZ construction of this multiplicity directly constructs $\mathbb{P}^3$. Namely, if $\Upsilon$ is the 0-dimensional face of Conv $\mathscr{A}$ associated with the vertex $b_1$, the fan over $\mathscr{A}/\Upsilon$ is indeed the fan for (a line bundle over) $\mathbb{P}^3$.

Now consider the general case. The vertices of Conv $\mathscr{A}$ are associated with toric divisors in $Z$. Let $D$ be the divisor associated with the vertex point. Now assume we have a basis for divisors which includes $D$. That is any divisor class will be written

$$sD + D_1, \tag{38}$$

where $D_1$ is a linear combination of the remaining basis elements. If $Z$ were compact we could use Poincaré duality to map divisors classes into $H^2(Z)$ and thus write the Kähler class in this form. Actually since we are computing masses of D-branes wrapping compact objects, we can restrict attention to compact subspaces of $Z$. We can thus restrict attention to compactly supported $H^2$ and then Poincaré duality works. We will, therefore, imagine that the Kähler form is dual to (38). Now consider some maximal dimensional compact toric subspace $K \subset Z$ of dimension $d_K$. The volume of $K$ is then

$$\int_K J^{d_K} = K \cap (sD + d_1)^{d_K}. \tag{39}$$

Suppose $m$ is such that $K \cap D^m \neq 0$ and $K \cap D^{m+1} = 0$. Then, in the large $s$ limit, the volume of $K$ goes as $s^m$.

The volume of $K \cap D$ is given by $K \cap D \cap (sD + d_1)^{d_K - 1}$. The volume of this clearly goes as $s^{m-1}$. Thus, if we normalize the D-branes wrapping all of $K$ to remain finite mass, the masses on $D \cap K$ go to zero. In this sense, $D$ represents the massless D-branes.

Note that this picture is not perfect. While D-branes on the divisor $D$ go massless in the large $s$ limit, there can be D-branes going massless on other divisors in this limit too. We give a more precise meaning to what the relationship between $D$ and massless D-branes is in section 5.3.

# 5 D-Brane Monodromy

We can get much more information about the discriminant by looking at the D-brane category. In particular we will consider the automorphisms of the category of D-branes induced by monodromy around the components of the discriminant. We view the multiplicity as the rank of the K-theory of a category associated with the monodromy. In this sense we are *categorifying* the discriminant multiplicity. We will need to use the technology of derived categories and triangulated categories for this section as it by far the best way to understand monodromy. We refer to [20], for example, for a review of the basic ideas.

## 5.1 Spherical Functors

Let $\mathsf{D}$ be the D-brane category, which will either be the bounded derived category of coherent sheaves (in a geometric phase) or the Fukaya category. For B-type branes, the category will be either $\mathbf{D}^b(Z_\Sigma)$ or $\mathbf{D}^b(X_\Sigma)$ depending on whether we use the noncompact or compact version of the GLSM.

Consider an exact functor

$$F : \mathsf{A} \to \mathsf{D}, \tag{40}$$

with a right adjoint $R$ and a left adjoint $L$. We can then define two more functors.[5] The

[5]To be pedantic, we need to go to dg-categories to truly define functors but this is of no practical consequence for this paper [21].

**cotwist** $C$ and **twist** $T$ associated to $F$ are the cones on the unit and counit of the adjunction

$$C = \mathrm{Cone}(1 \xrightarrow{\eta} RF) \qquad\qquad T = \mathrm{Cone}(FR \xrightarrow{\epsilon} 1).$$

The functor $F$ is called **spherical** if any two of the following conditions are true,

1. $T$ is an autoequivalence of $\mathsf{D}$,
2. $C$ is an autoequivalence of $\mathsf{A}$,
3. $R \cong LT[-1]$,
4. $R \cong CL$,

in which case all 4 conditions are true [21].

If $\mathsf{A}$ is a triangulated category then a **Serre functor** $S_{\mathsf{A}}$ is an autoequivalence of $\mathsf{A}$ such that, within $\mathsf{A}$,

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathsf{b}, S_{\mathsf{A}}\mathsf{b})^{\vee}. \tag{41}$$

If $\mathsf{A}$ and $\mathsf{D}$ both admit Serre functors then condition 4 above is equivalent to $S_{\mathbf{D}}FC \cong FS_{\mathbf{A}}$.

The spherical twist is quite natural in the context of D-brane monodromy as we now explain. As described in [22], D-brane monodromy is induced by changes in stability conditions as one goes around a loop in the moduli space of complexified Kähler forms. Recall that stable D-branes $\mathsf{c}$ have a central charge $Z(\mathsf{c})$ and a grade $\xi(\mathsf{c})$ such that

$$\xi(\mathsf{c}) = -\frac{1}{\pi}\arg(Z(\mathsf{c})) \pmod 2. \tag{42}$$

In a distinguished triangle



(43)

$\mathsf{c}$ is stable with respect to decay into $\mathsf{a}[1]$ and $\mathsf{b}$ if and only if $\xi(\mathsf{b}) - \xi(\mathsf{a}) < 1$.

Let us suppose $\mathsf{a}$ is a D-brane which can become massless. Assume, for simplicity of argument, there is a simple zero in $Z(\mathsf{a})$ at some point $P$ in the moduli space. Suppose also that $\mathsf{b}$ is massive at $P$, i.e., $Z(\mathsf{b}) \neq 0$. Now go counterclockwise around a small loop enclosing $P$. $\xi(\mathsf{b})$ will not change but $\xi(\mathsf{a})$ will decrease, and the result may change $\mathsf{c}$ from being unstable to stable.

So, in going around the loop, we can change the set of stable objects. The monodromy on $\mathsf{D}$ reflects this change in stability. In its most naïve form, the idea in monodromy is that, given a starting D-brane, $\mathsf{b}$, you allow all possible massless D-branes $\mathsf{a}$ to bind to $\mathsf{b}$ as above to turn $\mathsf{b}$ into $\mathsf{c}$. The autoequivalence induced by the monodromy then replaces $\mathsf{b}$ by this new bound state.

This means that monodromy around $P$ is associated to a map $M$ from objects in $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ to *massless* objects in $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$, such that the action of monodromy replaces $\mathsf{b}$ by

$$\mathrm{Cone}(M(\mathsf{b}) \to \mathsf{b}). \tag{44}$$

Speaking loosely for a moment, let $\mathsf{A}$ be a category whose objects are the D-branes massless at $P$. The map $M$ must then factor through $\mathsf{A}$ and we write $M = FR$:

$$\mathsf{D} \xrightarrow{R} \mathsf{A} \xrightarrow{F} \mathsf{D}. \tag{45}$$

At present we have only defined these maps as set maps on objects in the categories. The natural thing to do is to elevate them to functors. Why we should do this depends on an understanding of the morphisms in $\mathsf{A}$. We will not attempt this here but will assume these maps are functors from now on.

The map in (44) therefore gives a map of functors

$$FR \longrightarrow \mathbf{1}, \tag{46}$$

which, presumably, we want to be a natural map. This is instantly recognizable as the counit of adjunction and so we say $R$ is the right-adjoint of the functor $F$. Thus we arrive at monodromy being given by the spherical functor associated with $\mathsf{A}$ being the category of massless D-branes.

While we have motivated associating a spherical functor with monodromy, we cannot really claim to have derived it since we really don't say why $F$ and $R$ should be functors rather than just maps on objects. Having said that, if we do associate monodromy with a spherical functor, it does seem that $\mathsf{A}$ gives the category of massless D-branes.

Actually even this latter statement requires some care. There is an alternative picture for how the monodromy turns $\mathsf{b}$ into $\mathsf{c}$. Suppose that the added $\mathsf{a}$ is simply a direct sum $\mathbf{b} \oplus \mathsf{c}[-1]$. Then, rather than saying $\mathsf{c}$ is a equivalent to a massless D-brane $\mathsf{a}$ added to $\mathsf{b}$, we have obtained $\mathsf{c}$ crudely from $\mathsf{b}$ by simply annihilating it completely and then adding $\mathsf{c}$. While the central charge of $\mathbf{b} \oplus \mathsf{c}[-1]$ is zero at $P$, we don't consider it as a massless D-brane as it is not stable.

One can take this to an extreme. In [23] it was shown by Segal that *any* autoequivalence of the D-brane category can be written as a spherical twist. This construction was done by taking *all* elements of $\mathsf{A}$ to be of the form $\mathbf{b} \oplus \mathsf{c}[-1]$ in the above sense.

Given an autoequivalence there is thus an ambiguity in specifying the source category $\mathsf{A}$. Clearly we want to find the one generated by stable massless objects and thus be "as far as possible" from the Segal construction. This appears to be satisfied in the cases we consider below as in each case $\mathsf{A}$ is generated by stable branes we know to be massless.

## 5.2 Generic Monodromy

Given that we associate a spherical twist with $\mathsf{A}$, the category of massless D-branes, and that the Higgs GLSM describes the singularity structure, we arrive at an obvious conjecture:

**Conjecture 5.** *The generic monodromy around a component of the discriminant is given by a spherical twist, where* $\mathsf{A}$ *is the category of D-branes in the associated Higgs GLSM.*

This conjecture can be applied in the noncompact case $Z_\Sigma$ as well as the compact case $X_\Sigma$. In the compact case we impose the superpotential constraint. In derived category language

this means that we look at the category of matrix factorizations of the superpotential within the Higgs GLSM.

For the primary component of the discriminant we know that the Higgs GLSM is trivial, i.e., that of a point, and thus the category $\mathsf{A}$ is generated by a single object. We therefore expect generic monodromy around this component to be associated with a single D-brane becoming massless. That is, the monodromy is a Seidel–Thomas autoequivalence [24]. This is a conjecture apparently due to Kontsevich [25].

Note that our conjecture does not fully specify the spherical twist. We do not specify the functor $F : \mathsf{A} \to \mathbf{D}^b(X)$, we merely specify what $\mathsf{A}$ is. This is because we have not given enough information to specify $F$. The monodromy requires a choice of basepoint and a particular path around the discriminant. A change in path can result in a quite different functor $F$. We will see this very explicitly in section 5.3.2.

## 5.3 Relationship to a Horja Twist

There is clearly a relationship between the above conjecture and the spherical twists due to Horja [26]. Recall that given[6]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xhookrightarrow{i} & Z\ , \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle q} & & \\ U & & \end{array} \tag{47}$$

there is an associated spherical functor

$$i_* q^* : \mathbf{D}^b(U) \to \mathbf{D}^b(Z). \tag{48}$$

That is, $\mathbf{D}^b(U)$ represents the category of massless D-branes $\mathsf{A}$.. The general idea is that something equivalent to $\mathbf{D}^b(U)$ becomes massless as $E$ is collapsed onto $U$ [27].

Now consider the following process associated to a face $\Gamma$ of Conv $\mathscr{A}$. Begin with a fan $\Sigma$ given by a triangulation of $\mathscr{A}$, and the associated toric variety $Z_\Sigma$. Now do a minimal detriangulation of $\mathscr{A}$, to a polytopal (not necessarily simplicial) decomposition, so that the face $\Gamma$ is not subdivided. That is, $\Gamma$ is now the face of a polytope . This produces a toric variety we will call $Z_{\Sigma\setminus\Gamma}$. The detriangulation produces a blow-down

$$r : Z_\Sigma \to Z_{\Sigma\setminus\Gamma}. \tag{49}$$

$\Gamma$ now spans a cone $\sigma_\Gamma$ in the fan, and there is an associated sub-toric-variety $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ given as an orbit closure. (See section 3.2 of [13].) So we have an inclusion $j : V(\sigma_\Gamma) \hookrightarrow Z_{\Sigma\setminus\Gamma}$. But $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ is exactly the target space of the (noncompact) Higgs GLSM. So we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_\Gamma & \xhookrightarrow{\hat{\imath}} & Z_\Sigma\ , \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \hat{q}} & & \\ V(\sigma_\Gamma) & & \end{array} \tag{50}$$

[6]We've already used the letter $Z$, so we replace $Z$ in Horja's notation by $U$,




Figure 8: Two possibilities for non-circuits.

where $E_\Gamma$ is $r^{-1}jV(\sigma_\Gamma)$.

We have identified the massless D-brane category as coming from the Higgs GLSM and thus we identify it with $D(V(\sigma_\Gamma))$. So we identify $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ with $U$ in Horja's picture. So, identifying the spherical functor with $i_*q^*$, we have cast the desired monodromy in the form of a Horja twist.

The difficulty in comparing our conjecture to the Horja twist is when we try to establish exactly which path in the moduli space generates this automorphism, but we can describe a simple case as follows.

The Horja picture is usually applied to the case of a codimension one wall in the secondary fan between two phases. The way this description is extracted from the toric data is explained in detail in section 2.6 of [7]. This wall is associated to a $\mathbb{P}^1$ in the moduli space, and to a "circuit" in the pointset in sense of chapter 7 of [1].[7] The Horja twist is then associated to monodromy around the unique point in the intersection of this $\mathbb{P}^1$ with the discriminant that is not one of the two limit points. This is called the "wall monodromy".

The following proposition is clear:

**Proposition 6.** *If the points of $\mathscr{A} \cap \Gamma$ form a circuit then the corresponding wall monodromy coincides with the generic monodromy around $\Delta_{\mathscr{A}\cap\Gamma}$.*

As this is probably well-known, we sketch the idea briefly. (We will also see an example to illustrate the idea in section 5.3.1). The homogeneous coordinates $b_\beta$ in the circuit can be combined to form a unique invariant affine coordinate $x$ on the moduli space. This affine coordinate is also an affine coordinate on the $\mathbb{P}^1$ in the moduli space. Furthermore, the function $\Delta_{\mathscr{A}\cap\Gamma}$ can be written purely (up to an overall factor) as a function of $x$. Thus this component of the discriminant intersects the $\mathbb{P}^1$ transversely. This proves the proposition.

Given that the Horja twist can be proven to give the wall monodromy [28], we see that our conjecture is true in this case.

Many complications arise when there are more points in $\mathscr{A} \cap \Gamma$ than needed to form a circuit. Let us consider two ways in this can happen as shown in figure 8. These figures show a non-circuit. The first arrow shows a change in triangulation as one crosses a codimension

[7] Briefly, a circuit is a set of points satisfying precisely one affine relation involving all the points.

one face in the secondary fan. The last figure on each row corresponds to the detriangulation $\Sigma\backslash\Gamma$.

The simplest case would be $\mathscr{A}$ consisting of 4 points in a line as shown in figure 8a. A fan over this gives the resolution of the quotient singularity $\mathbb{C}^2/\mathbb{Z}_3$. The exceptional set here is two $\mathbb{P}^1$'s. This example is associated to an SU(3) Seiberg–Witten theory. Crossing the wall to a neighboring phase blows down one of the $\mathbb{P}^1$'s whereas the detriangulation of this set blows down *both* $\mathbb{P}^1$'s. The wall monodromy corresponds to the generic monodromy around the discriminant and thus corresponds to blowing down only a single $\mathbb{P}^1$. The detriangulation of the face, blowing both $\mathbb{P}^1$'s down, should more naturally be associated with the Argyres–Douglas point [29]. In this case it is clear that the generic monodromy around the component of the discriminant is *not* given naïvely by the Horja twist associated to a detriangulation of the face.

Both maps in the case of 8b correspond to a fibration. The first map plays the role of $q$ in (47) for wall monodromy and the two maps composed plays the role of $\hat{q}$ in (50) for the generic monodromy. So we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xhookrightarrow{\ i\ } & Z_\Sigma \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle q} & & \\ F \longrightarrow U & & \\ \downarrow & & \\ V(\sigma_\Gamma) & & \end{array} \tag{51}$$

We claim that this corresponds to a non-transverse collision between the $\mathbb{P}^1$ joining the limit points and the discriminant. Rather than develop this idea in general, we will just give some examples below. In particular we will highlight the case when $U \to V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ is a projective space fibration.

In general the situation comparing wall monodromy to generic monodromy is a combination of the effects exemplified by the two cases in figure 8. Furthermore, the factored map $E \to U \to V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ need not be a fibration. We won't consider these cases here.

We can also look at the components of the discriminant associated to the vertices of Conv $\mathscr{A}$. In this case, no blowing down at all is necessary — $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ is already a divisor in $Z$. The associated Horja twist is the correct one. The spherical twist corresponding an inclusion of a divisor $D$ corresponds [21] to tensoring by a line bundle $\mathscr{O}(D)$, consistent with a large radius limit monodromy. The questions arises, however, exactly why in this case the Horja monodromy is associated to a limit point, and not a point in the wall between phases. The exact rules are not clear to us.

Rather than try to establish the exact rules, let us present some interesting examples. These serve to show the relationship between our conjecture and the Horja twists along phase walls. We can also view these examples as proving the conjecture true in these cases. We also use these examples to demonstrate the issue of going from the noncompact $Z$ to the compact $X$.

### 5.3.1 The Octic

We refer back to figure 2 for the geometry of the discriminant in the case of the octic. The large radius Calabi–Yau phase has two neighbouring phases, the orbifold and the $\mathbb{P}^1$ hybrid. We first consider Horja's wall monodromy in these two cases.

First we take the hybrid phase. In the compact picture we have the entire Calabi–Yau threefold $X$ collapsing down to $\mathbb{P}^1$. But to compare to our conjecture we need the ambient noncompact version of the collapse. The weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}^4_{\{2,2,2,1,1\}}$ is singular along a $\mathbb{P}^2$. We can blow this singular set up to get a smooth compact 4-fold $S$. $S$ is a $\mathbb{P}^3$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$. In the Calabi–Yau phase, the space $Z$ is the canonical line bundle over $S$. Going to the hybrid phase collapses $S$ to the base $\mathbb{P}^1$. Thus the phase changing collapse $q : E \to U$ is given by $q : S \to \mathbb{P}^1$. The category of massless D-branes for the singularity in the wall between the phases is therefore $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)$.

This wall monodromy is not generic monodromy however. It is well-known how to disentangle the generic monodromy from the wall monodromy. For explicit details see [27,30]. For a spherical functor with source category $\mathsf{A}$, let the corresponding spherical twist be denoted $T_{\mathsf{A}}$. If $L$ is a line bundle then let $L$ also denote the automorphism $- \otimes L$. By [31] we have $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1) = \langle \mathscr{O}, \mathscr{O}(1) \rangle$. Then, by Horja, the wall monodromy is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)} &= T_{\langle \mathscr{O}, \mathscr{O}(1) \rangle}, \\ &= T_{\langle \mathscr{O} \rangle} \circ T_{\langle \mathscr{O}(1) \rangle}, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

but from the link topology at this point on the discriminant [30], we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^1)} &= (T_{\mathsf{A}} \circ \mathscr{O}(1))^2 \circ \mathscr{O}(1)^{-2} \\ &= T_{\mathsf{A}} \circ \mathscr{O}(1) \circ T_{\mathsf{A}} \circ \mathscr{O}(1)^{-1} \\ &= T_{\mathsf{A}} \circ T_{\mathsf{A} \otimes \mathscr{O}(1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where $\mathsf{A}$ is the massless D-brane category for meridians around a generic point on $\Delta_0$, the primary component of the discriminant. So we can identify

$$T_{\mathsf{A}} = T_{\langle \mathscr{O} \rangle}. \tag{54}$$

We are therefore consistent with the above conjecture. The massless D-brane for this primary component is a single object. In this case $i_* q^* \mathscr{O} \cong \mathscr{O}_S$. This wall monodromy associated component of the discriminant is actually an example of the type shown in figure 8b and equation (51). The component of the discriminant in this case is the primary component $\Delta_0$ and thus we expect $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ to be simply a point. $U$ is given by $\mathbb{P}^1$. We claim the fact that $U$ is a $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ gives rise to the link topology above. We will discuss this again in section 5.3.3 when $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ is not trivial.

Restricting to the compact octic hypersurface $X$, we see that the massless D-brane for the primary component of the discriminant is $\mathscr{O}_X$.

Now consider the component $\Delta_1$ in figure 5. The is associated to the bottom edge of $\operatorname{Conv} \mathscr{A}$ in figure 2 with 3 points. This is a circuit and we are in the situation described




Figure 9: The discriminant for the exoflop example.

above. Thus $\Delta_1$ intersects the $\mathbb{P}^1$ connecting the Calabi–Yau and orbifold phase transversely. The wall monodromy between these two phases is the same thing as the generic monodromy around this component of the discriminant as discussed above. Using the methods of [7], we see that $E$ is associated to the exceptional divisor of the blow-up. This is a noncompact space which is the total space of the line bundle $\mathscr{O}(-4,0)$ over $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. $Y$ is the then the blow-down of this to $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(-4)$. Horja then tells us the category of massless D-branes is $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(-4))$. This is entirely consistent with our conjecture as expected. Quotienting out the space spanned by this edge leaves us with the GLSM Higgs data for $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(-4)$.

Since $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(-4)$ deformation retracts to $\mathbb{P}^2$ we have an Euler characteristic of 3. The derived category is similarly of K-theory rank 3. Thus we are consistent with the multiplicity of 3 in the discriminant in figure 5.

Note that it is not obvious how to pass to the compact model $X_\Sigma$ in this case. $Y$ should be viewed now as a genus 3 curve in $\mathbb{P}^2$. That is, the category of massless D-branes should be the derived category of this higher-genus curve. The rank of topological K-theory is 2 and so one might predict that the multiplicity of the discriminant should drop to 2 when passing to the compact model.

The component of the discriminant passing through the Calabi–Yau and orbifold phase is associated to the vertex $b_1$ (or $b_2$ or $b_3$). This yields the divisor $V(\sigma_{b_1})$ given by $\mathscr{O}(-8)$ over $\mathbb{P}^3_{2,2,1,1}$. The space is singular so we cannot use the Euler characteristic directly. However, the K-theory is of rank 6, consistent with the figure.

Finally the component of the discriminant passing through the Calabi–Yau and $\mathbb{P}^1$ limit is associated with $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(-4)$, which is consistent with the multiplicity of 4.

Again the multiplicities of these latter two components will presumably drop when we pass to the compact model.

### 5.3.2 An example with an ambiguity

Here we give an example where a single component of the discriminant is associated with two apparently different massless D-branes. We use an example where the Calabi–Yau phase

consists of $Z_\Sigma$ being the canonical line bundle of the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle $\mathbb{P}(\mathscr{O}(-1)\oplus\mathscr{O})$ over $\mathbb{P}^3$. This was studied in [7], for example, and has charge matrix

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -3 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ -2 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{55}$$

The discriminant is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\mathscr{A}} = {} & b_1^3 b_2^4 b_3^6 b_4^6 b_5^6 b_6^6 (256 b_1^5 b_2^4 - 3^3 5^5 b_2 b_3^2 b_4^2 b_5^2 b_6^2 + 18000 b_0 b_1^2 b_2^2 b_3 b_4 b_5 b_6 \\ & - 256 b_0^2 b_1^4 b_2^3 + 3800 b_0^3 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4 b_5 b_6 + 96 b_0^4 b_1^3 b_2^2 - 27 b_0^5 b_3 b_4 b_5 b_6 - 16 b_0^6 b_1^2 b_2 + b_0^8 b_1). \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

The moduli space and discriminant are depicted in figure 9. Note that, beside the vertex monomials associated with limit points, there is only one component, $\Delta_0$, of the discriminant. This component has a quite rich geometry, however, having both a node and a cusp.

The CY$-\mathbb{P}^3$ transition is very similar to the octic above. The Horja picture has $E$ given by the $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^3$ collapsing to the base $Y \cong \mathbb{P}^3$. The category of massless D-branes associated to this wall monodromy is thus given by $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}^3) = \langle \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}, \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(1), \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(2), \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}(3)\rangle$. However, $\Delta_0$ intersects the line joining these limit points with multiplicity 4. After disentangling the wall monodromy from the generic monodromy around $\Delta$ we find the generic monodromy associated to a single massless D-brane $\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$. In terms of the noncompact ambient space $Z$, this massless D-brane is $q^*\mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3}$, which is the structure sheaf of the whole $\mathbb{P}^1$-bundle over $\mathbb{P}^3$. That is, the support of the sheaf representing this massless D-brane has complex dimension 4. Restricting to the compact $X$, this massless D-brane is $\mathscr{O}_X$, of complex dimension 3.

Now consider the CY–Exoflop transition. Now the $\mathbb{P}^3$ base collapses to a point. The Horja wall monodromy is a simple Seidel–Thomas autoequivalence associated to the massless D-brane $\mathscr{O}_W$, where $W \cong \mathbb{P}^3$ is given by $x_0 = x_1 = 0$. Since $\Delta_0$ intersects this wall transversely, this is also the generic monodromy around $\Delta_0$. Thus the monodromy is associated with a single massless D-brane of the form $W \cong \mathbb{P}^3$. Restricting to the compact $X$, we see a massless D-brane corresponding to a cubic surface, $\mathrm{dP}_6$, in $W$.

We have therefore arrived at two different answers for the D-brane massless category associated with the generic monodromy around $\Delta_0$. In compact language we either get $\mathscr{O}_X$ or $\mathscr{O}_E$, where $E$ is the del Pezzo surface $\mathrm{dP}_6$. We show this in figure 9. This does not break our main conjecture, however. In both cases the massless D-brane category is generated by a single object. It is trivially the same intrinsic category in each case. What differs is how the spherical functor $F$ maps this category into $\mathbf{D}^b(X)$ or $\mathbf{D}^b(Z)$.

What this shows is that the combinatorial data for the GKZ determinant can tell us what the category $\mathsf{A}$ is, but we require more data to specify the functor $F$.

### 5.3.3 A Three Parameter Example

It would be nice see an example of (51) where $U$ and $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ are distinct and nontrivial. To see this we need to go to a 3-parameter example. We will consider the case where $X$ is (a




Figure 10: The discriminant for $\mathbb{P}^4_{\{12,8,2,1,1\}}$.

resolution of) a degree 24 hypersurface in $\mathbb{P}^4_{\{12,8,2,1,1\}}$. $X$ is also then an elliptic fibration over the Hirzebruch surface $\mathbb{F}_2$. The matrix of charges is

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} -6 & 3 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & -2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{57}$$

The model has 8 phases and the secondary polytope is isomorphic to a cube.

Three phases are adjacent to the Calabi–Yau phase:

- A hybrid model given by a Landau–Ginzburg-fibration over $\mathbb{F}_2$.
- A K3-fibration over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The fibres are singular and the resulting space has a curve of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-quotient singularities.
- An elliptic fibration over $\mathbb{P}^2_{\{2,1,1\}}$. This also has a curve of $\mathbb{Z}_2$-quotient singularities.

Computing the GKZ determinant we find

$$E_{\mathscr{A}} = 2^8 3^{12} b_1^{12} b_2^{16} b_3^{12} b_4^{12} b_5^{12} \Delta_0 \Delta_1^5 \Delta_2^6. \tag{58}$$

The cone in the secondary fan corresponding to the Calabi–Yau phase gives an affine toric patch in the moduli space with coordinates $x = b_0^{-6} b_1^3 b_2^2 b_7$, $y = b_3 b_6 b_7^{-2}$ and $z = b_4 b_5 b_6^{-2}$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_0 &= b_0^{24}(2^{22}3^{12}x^4y^2z - 2^{20}3^{12}x^4y^2 + \ldots + 1728x - 1) \\ \Delta_1 &= b_7^4(64y^2z - 16y^2 + 8y - 1) \\ \Delta_2 &= b_6^2(4z - 1) \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

We show how the components of the discriminant hit the lines between phase limits in figure 10. Note this is a very schematic drawing — the discriminant in this case is complex dimension 2. We will consider the wall monodromies for all 3 cases in this figure.

$\Delta_2$ has a transverse collision with the line joining the Calabi–Yau phase to the elliptic fibration over $\mathbb{P}^2_{\{2,1,1\}}$. The Horja wall monodromy corresponds to a collapse in the ambient $Z$ of (line bundles over) $\mathbb{P}^2_{\{3,2,1\}} \times \mathbb{P}^1$ to $\mathbb{P}^2_{\{3,2,1\}}$. The rank of K-theory of $\mathbb{P}^2_{\{3,2,1\}}$ is 6 consistent with the exponent of $\Delta_2$ in (58). Again we saw a similar effect in the octic. In this case $U \cong V(\sigma_\Gamma) \cong \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2_{\{3,2,1\}}}(-6)$.

Now consider $\Delta_1$. This component hits with degree 2 the line joining the Calabi–Yau phase to the K3-fibration. By setting $x = 0$, we get the same geometry for the collision as we did in the case of the octic's $\Delta_0$. The homotopy of the link complement is thus the same as in the case of the octic.

According to Horja's picture, the wall monodromy is associated with a collapse of the subspace, $E \subset Z$, given by $x_7 = 0$, to the subspace $U$ in the neighboring phase given by $x_3 = x_6 = 0$. In particular we find the tower of vertical maps in (51) becomes

$$\begin{array}{c} E \cong \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1_{\{3,2\}}}(-6) \times \mathbb{F}_2 \\ \downarrow \\ U \cong \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1_{\{3,2\}}}(-6) \times \mathbb{P}^1 \\ \downarrow \\ V(\sigma_\Gamma) \cong \mathscr{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1_{\{3,2\}}}(-6) \end{array} \tag{60}$$

The best way to understand this wall monodromy is from a theorem due to Orlov [32]. Suppose we have a vector bundle $E \to M$ of rank $r$. There is then an associated bundle $\mathbb{P}(E)$ with fibre given by a projective space $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}$. Furthermore, there is a canonically defined sheaf $\mathscr{O}(1)$ on $\mathbb{P}(E)$ (see, for example, section II.7 of [33]). Orlov's theorem then tells us that there is a semiorthogonal decomposition

$$\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{P}(E)) = \langle \mathbf{D}^b(M), \mathbf{D}^b(M) \otimes \mathscr{O}(1), \mathbf{D}^b(M) \otimes \mathscr{O}(2), \ldots, \mathbf{D}^b(M) \otimes \mathscr{O}(r-1) \rangle. \tag{61}$$

This allows us to interpret the connection with generic monodromy the same way as we did for the octic. We put $U = \mathbb{P}(E)$ and $M = V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ and $r = 2$ and obtain

$$\mathbf{D}^b(U) = \langle \mathbf{D}^b(V(\sigma_\Gamma)), \mathbf{D}^b(V(\sigma_\Gamma)) \otimes \mathscr{O}(1) \rangle. \tag{62}$$

The massless D-brane category for the wall monodromy is $\mathbf{D}^b(U)$ but, because of the degree 2 intersection, we relate this to a generic monodromy around this component of the discriminant to $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$. Thus we are in complete agreement with our main conjecture again.

It is not hard to see how this construction always works in the case that $U$ is of the form of the projectivization $\mathbb{P}(E)$ of a bundle over $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$.

$\Delta_0$ hits the line joining the Calabi–Yau phase and the hybrid at a point of degree 4. In this case $U \cong \mathbb{F}_2$ and $V(\sigma_\Gamma)$ is a point according to the conjecture. In order to verify the consistency of this assertion we would need to analyze the structure of the homotopy of the complement of the discriminant near the collision point. This is difficult and we do not attempt it. What we would expect, however, is that we would build the derived category of $\mathbb{F}_2$ from an exceptional collection four point-like objects.

# 6 Discussion

We have seen that the GKZ A-determinant plays a key role in the gauged linear $\sigma$-model. Obviously it would be very nice to have a direct GLSM computation of the GKZ determinant. One would expect this to come from a suitable computation of a partition function. However, the GKZ determinant has an anomalous degree as given in section 3.2.3 so some care would be needed in this approach. It would be very satisfying to see a direct computation of this anomaly too from the field theory.

By indirectly analyzing the GKZ determinant in terms of singularities and monodromy, we appear to have a nice picture of the discriminant for the noncompact story. Each component of the discriminant is associated to a category of massless D-branes which describes, via a spherical twist, the generic monodromy in the D-brane category. An explicit form of the functor in this spherical twist requires more information, such as a choice of large radius limit phase and a choice of path from this limit to the meridian where we do the monodromy. But the intrinsic structure of the massless D-brane category requires no such choice. This category encodes the "badness" of the singularity.

We have proven that the multiplicities match between the GKZ picture and the GLSM picture and we have a natural conjecture for the monodromy. Before we can prove the latter, we need to understand the meaning of the morphisms in this massless category. Obviously they play an essential rôle but we don't know any motivation for their interpretation yet. It would be nice to analyze the Higgs GLSM directly and see if there is an interpretation of the morphisms in terms of open strings. Presumably, methods such as [28] may be of help here.

In the noncompact case we have a clear picture of the multiplicities of the components of the discriminant. One can easily extract the rank of the algebraic K-theory group $K_0$. In the examples in this paper, the massless D-brane category had an exceptional collection and this rank is simply the number of elements in this collection. The niceties of toric geometry imply that this rank is also the rank of topological $K_0$, which encodes the rank of the group of massless D-brane charges, and the Witten index.

The compact case is much harder. The massless D-brane category could easily now be something like a K3 category, where the Chow ring is infinitely generated, and thus the algebraic K-theory group is unpleasant. Now if, one supposes that the desired multiplicity comes from the topological K-theory one needs to extract this information from the massless category. This can be done [34] but it is far from straight-forward.

In this paper we have avoided going down the standard route of solving Picard–Fuchs equations and looking at periods, couplings, etc. Presumably the meaning of multiplicity has some meaning using these methods and one could link the results in this paper to such techniques.

# Acknowledgments

We thank Nick Addington and Ed Segal for helpful discussions. PSA is supported by NSF grants DMS–1207708. MRP is supported by NSF grant PHY–1521053. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

# References

[1] I. M. Gelfand, M. M. Kapranov, and A. V. Zelevinski, *Discriminants, Resultants and Multidimensional Determinants*, Birkhäuser, 1994.

[2] V. V. Batyrev, *Dual Polyhedra and Mirror Symmetry for Calabi–Yau Hypersurfaces in Toric Varieties*, J. Alg. Geom. **3** (1994) 493–535.

[3] E. Witten, *Phases of $N = 2$ Theories in Two Dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B403** (1993) 159–222, hep-th/9301042.

[4] L. Borisov, *Towards the Mirror Symmetry for Calabi–Yau Complete Intersections in Gorenstein Toric Fano Varieties*, alg-geom/9310001.

[5] P. S. Aspinwall and B. R. Greene, *On the Geometric Interpretation of $N = 2$ Superconformal Theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B437** (1995) 205–230, hep-th/9409110.

[6] K. Hori and C. Vafa, *Mirror symmetry*, arXiv:hep-th/0002222.

[7] N. Addington and P. S. Aspinwall, *Categories of Massless D-Branes and del Pezzo Surfaces*, JHEP **1307** (2013) 176, arXiv:1305.5767.

[8] P. S. Aspinwall and M. R. Plesser, *General Mirror Pairs for Gauged Linear Sigma Models*, JHEP **11** (2015) 029, arXiv:1507.00301.

[9] P. S. Aspinwall, B. R. Greene, and D. R. Morrison, *Calabi–Yau Moduli Space, Mirror Manifolds and Spacetime Topology Change in String Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 414–480.

[10] E. Witten, *Mirror Manifolds and Topological Field Theory*, in S.-T. Yau, editor, "Essays on Mirror Manifolds", International Press, 1992, hep-th/9112056.

[11] P. Candelas et al., *Mirror Symmetry for Two Parameter Models — I*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 481–562, hep-th/9308083.

[12] M. M. Kapranov, *A characterization of A-discriminantal hypersurfaces in terms of the logarithmic Gauss map*, Math. Ann. **290** (1991) 277–285.

[13] D. A. Cox, J. B. Little, and H. K. Schenck, *Toric Varities*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics **124**, AMS, 2010.

[14] E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial Commutative Algebra*, Springer, 2005.

[15] D. R. Morrison and M. R. Plesser, *Summing the Instantons: Quantum Cohomology and Mirror Symmetry in Toric Varieties*, Nucl. Phys. **B440** (1995) 279–354, hep-th/9412236.

[16] J. A. Harvey, D. Kutasov, E. J. Martinec, and G. W. Moore, *Localized Tachyons and RG Flows*, hep-th/0111154.

[17] D. R. Morrison, K. Narayan, and M. R. Plesser, *Localized Tachyons in* $\mathbb{C}^3/\mathbb{Z}_N$, JHEP **08** (2004) 047, arXiv:hep-th/0406039.

[18] A. Givental, *A Mirror Theorem for Toric Complete Intersections*, in "Topological field theory, primitive forms and related topics (Kyoto, 1996)", Progr. Math. **160**, pages 141–175, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1998, alg-geom/9701016.

[19] P. Candelas, A. Font, S. Katz, and D. R. Morrison, *Mirror Symmetry for Two Parameter Models — II*, Nucl. Phys. **B429** (1994) 626–674, hep-th/9403187.

[20] P. S. Aspinwall, *D-Branes on Calabi–Yau Manifolds*, in J. M. Maldacena, editor, "Progress in String Theory. TASI 2003 Lecture Notes", pages 1–152, World Scientific, 2005, hep-th/0403166.

[21] R. Anno and T. Logvinenko, *Spherical DG-functors*, arXiv:1309.5035.

[22] P. S. Aspinwall and M. R. Douglas, *D-Brane Stability and Monodromy*, JHEP **05** (2002) 031, hep-th/0110071.

[23] E. Segal, *All Autoequivalences are Spherical Twists*, arXiv:1603.06717.

[24] P. Seidel and R. P. Thomas, *Braid Groups Actions on Derived Categories of Coherent Sheaves*, Duke Math. J. **108** (2001) 37–108, math.AG/0001043.

[25] M. Kontsevich, 1996, Rutgers Lecture, unpublished.

[26] R. P. Horja, *Derived Category Automorphisms from Mirror Symmetry*, math.AG/-0103231.

[27] P. S. Aspinwall, R. L. Karp, and R. P. Horja, *Massless D-branes on Calabi-Yau threefolds and monodromy*, Commun. Math. Phys. **259** (2005) 45–69, hep-th/0209161.

[28] M. Herbst, K. Hori, and D. Page, *Phases Of* $N = 2$ *Theories In* $1+1$ *Dimensions With Boundary*, arXiv:0803.2045.

[29] P. C. Argyres and M. R. Douglas, *New Phenomena in SU(3) Supersymmetric Gauge Theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B448** (1995) 93–126, hep-th/9505062.

[30] P. S. Aspinwall, *Some Navigation Rules for D-brane Monodromy*, J. Math. Phys. **42** (2001) 5534–5552, hep-th/0102198.

[31] A. A. Beilinson, *Coherent Sheaves on $\mathbb{P}^n$ and Problems in Linear Algebra*, Func. Anal. Appl. **12** (1978) 214–216.

[32] D. O. Orlov, *Projective Bundles, Monoidal Transformations, and Derived Categories of Coherent Sheaves*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **56** (1992) 852–862.

[33] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **52**, Springer-Verlag, 1977.

[34] A. Blanc, *Topological K-theory of Complex Noncommutative Spaces*, Compositio Math. **152** (2016) 489555, arXiv:1211.7360.